

DAY OF SILENCE

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the National Day of Silence, which is coordinated nationally by the Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network, and organizes students across our country to take a vow of silence for the day to highlight the bullying and harassment that many LGBT youth encounter in their public schools.

I am proud to join Congressman ENGEL from New York to introduce a resolution today in support of the goals of the National Day of Silence, and I will continue to work in this Chamber to raise awareness about this ongoing problem.

I ask that the House now join me in observing a moment of silence for LGBT youth who are victims of harassment and violence in cities and towns all across this country, and as a symbol of our commitment to guarantee that every child in America can study and learn in a safe environment.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DICK FALLOW

(Mrs. BUSTOS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BUSTOS. I rise today to talk about the recent passing of Dick Fallow, a great friend to working men and women of the Quad-City region of Illinois and Iowa and a great ally to American workers.

Dick spent his life fighting to improve the lives of others. He was a tireless and a passionate advocate for working families and a true champion for civil rights.

As a young man, Dick served his country by driving an ambulance in World War II. Later, in the 1960s, he fought for civil rights legislation.

He is best known for being a lifelong local and national leader on behalf of the American worker. He showed up at every labor rally, picket line, and civil rights event. Rain, snow, heat, old age, and sickness, nothing could deter Dick Fallow from fighting on behalf of working people.

He was a rousing public speaker and inspired generations of Illinoisans and Iowans to get involved in public service. He also was a devoted and loving family man.

I know my husband, Gerry, and I join so many others in extending our deepest condolences to Dick Fallow's family. He will truly be missed.

REAL TAX REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, this is a conversation about something that's very pertinent to all Americans right now, and that is their taxes. Obviously, this is tax week, which was punctuated by an incredibly difficult day in Boston.

But this is also tax freedom day that's happening April 18. It's a recognition that if Americans worked their entire year they could get to this point. For many areas of the country, this would be the day they're finally paying into their own family, rather than paying into the Federal Government or the State and local Treasury.

Now, that differs from area to area, but this shows, again, the significance of what it really means to get to a point like this where we have to look again at our Tax Code.

Today is the day just to be able to pause and say: Where are we with our Tax Code, and where are we with our budget?

Let me just highlight a couple of things. Then I have several colleagues that I want to get a chance to yield the floor to to get a chance to continue this conversation.

There's a lot of conversation about our budget, rightfully so. We're over \$1 trillion overspending this year, the same as we did the year before, the year before, and the year before. Now, for the fifth year in a row something has happened that's never happened ever in American history. We've overspent the budget by \$1 trillion.

Let me set aside something else, though, for people to be able to look at, and that is, this year, in the Federal Treasury, we will receive the highest amount of tax revenue ever in the history of the United States Treasury. Make sure no one misses that. We'll receive more revenue this year than we ever have in the history of the United States Government. Yet, we're still overspending \$1 trillion.

We have serious budget issues, but they're not tax revenue as far as how much is coming in issues; it's overspending. But our issue with taxes is not the issue of the tax rate not necessarily having enough. It's the issue of how we do it.

It's such a convoluted mess to be able to go through our thousands and thousands of pages of Tax Code. We need to stop and be able to evaluate this: Is this really the right way to do it?

The purpose of tax action is to tax the smallest amount possible to run an efficient government. Is that really what we're doing in our Tax Code right now?

Is it a simple system that people can actually do? If so, why do people spend billions of dollars across America, and millions of hours, trying to fill out tax forms, and to be able to get it in on time in a way that's so complicated that when you turn it in, no one thinks that they actually turned it in correctly. No one.

So the challenge of this is, how can we get to real tax reform to be able to

solve many of the tax issues, to be able to benefit our Nation and what happens in the days ahead, and especially for our businesses that need so much help and would like to have the relief of the burden that they have to go through all this convoluted tax policy.

Let me introduce one of my dear friends. This is TOM REED from New York. He's a member of the Ways and Means Committee. They live and breathe and function with the Tax Code, and he is one of the leaders of trying to walk through the process of reforming this code.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Oklahoma for organizing this important topic and this conversation tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in an America that is fair. I believe in an America where the rules are simple, so that hardworking taxpayers in America understand what those rules are, and they're not subject to the jeopardy of violating the rules because they're too complicated.

□ 1350

I believe in an America where it's not judging a person by whom they know but, rather, who they are. And, Mr. Speaker, why I start my conversation with those beliefs is because we need to apply those beliefs to getting rid of this broken, complicated Tax Code that we have in America. What we have is a Code that is not simple, that is not fair, that is way too complicated. That's why I believe in going through commonsense tax reform for the purposes of coming up with a simple, fair, and reasonable Tax Code so that people can fill out their own taxes.

As my colleague from Oklahoma rightfully points out, people are spending billions of dollars on tax preparers, third parties, and millions of hours—that can otherwise go to their businesses or to their families—to fill out a tax return that they can't understand because the rules are too complicated.

Also, we have to end what we came here to Washington, D.C., to do, my colleague from Oklahoma and myself of this freshman class in November, 2010, and that is having our country under the control of the special interests and creating those loopholes in the Tax Code that go to narrowly tailored people because of whom they know.

We want a Tax Code, I want a Tax Code, and I know my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee want a Tax Code that promotes growth, that promotes economic opportunity, that promotes the opportunity for us to be competitive on the world stage. Because when America competes on a world stage in a competitive market, we win. We have the best workers. We have the best technology. We have freedom. We have the rule of law. We need to do commonsense tax reform for the purposes of putting us in a position where we can create the jobs today and for generations to come, because we will then create a fair, level playing

field that allows us to start building things in America, allows us to put people to work for generations to come.

So I appreciate my good friend from Oklahoma bringing this issue to the forefront and having this conversation tonight, and I know he's bringing forth a copy of the Code and the regulations. And all you have to do is look at that colossal piece of paper, or reams of papers, books of papers, 70,000 pages of statutory tax and regulation. We in America can do better. We as House Republicans demand us to do better. And we will do better under the leadership that House Republicans are doing in the Ways and Means Committee and as a Conference to make sure that we end up with a Code that is simple, fair, and no longer riddled with loopholes, big government handouts, big government subsidies. That's the principle of tax reform for the Republican side of the aisle.

Mr. LANKFORD. Thank you for those words of encouragement, because that is what we're all about.

As simple as this is, everyone would look at this Tax Code, the few notes that I brought with me to be able to reference where we really are on tax policy now, and see how large this has really become.

When we look at our tax policy, we say, How did it become this? It became this because we've added one new rule after another after another as it's gone through. Just since 2001, there have been 3,250 changes to the Tax Code. That's more than one per day. And they continue to rack up. And every business and every American has to try to rush to keep up with all this Tax Code, which leads to the problem of, How do I know that I actually filled it out correctly and completed all this? For many people, there is that sense that I didn't get a chance to write anything off as deductions but there are other people that know how to get out of this.

In this constant fight to say how do we fix this, first, we have to get to some basic definitions. One is, What does it mean to reform the Tax Code? Reforming the Tax Code seems to be a simple thing. That means we're going to fix it to make it simpler; we're going to make it more fair; we're going to make it more straightforward.

There are some that try to define reforming the Tax Code as a new way to be able to raise taxes on other people, to be able to take away this deduction or that loophole and find ways to keep this same convoluted, crony system of Tax Code, but we're going to find some way through it to be able to raise taxes on different groups of people. And so we accomplish more revenue by raising taxes rather than by fixing the system.

Again, I go back to we have the highest amount of revenue ever in the history of the Nation. This is not a tax revenue problem of how much is coming in. We have a serious spending problem. But we do have a Tax Code

problem, as well, that forces businesses to overspend for tax preparation when they should be taking care of customers and clients and their employees.

We can do better than all of this. We can do better, and we should. Again, there's this sense that within the Tax Code that, if we just create a couple more things, that we can fix the Tax Code, or maybe if we just raise rates on people, that will get in more revenue.

Let me tell you a quick story. My daughters at their school several years ago had a project between the fifth graders and the first graders. As they studied through American history, the fifth graders and the first graders both got to the American Revolution at the same time; obviously, at different levels of interest and different depth on the topic. But as they studied through the American Revolution, the fifth graders, at some point, would take the role of the British and the first graders would be the patriots, the Americans, the revolutionaries.

Actually, the week before, I got a note, as a parent, saying, You need to send 100 pennies with your first graders for next week's class. And all it was was just a note saying every first grader needs 100 pennies to come. And so I sent my first grader off to school that next week with 100 pennies in her little sack. She didn't know why.

They began studying the American Revolution, and midway through the day, the fifth grade class barges into class and says, There is now a tax on sharpening your pencil, and they would impose a one penny tax on sharpening your pencil. If you go to lunch, you also have to pay another penny to leave the classroom if you go to lunch. There's a one penny tax to get a piece of Kleenex as well. They just declared it, and they would come in. Several times throughout the course of the day, they would just pop in and start collecting their tax from people. Well, on Tuesday, they came in and they doubled their tax. It's now 2 cents to sharpen your pencil, it's 2 cents to get a Kleenex, and its 2 cents to head to lunch. And so on Wednesday, it comes again and they add new things again to it.

So by Wednesday night, do you know what my first grader did? My first grader, Wednesday night, came home and said, Dad, I need to take 10 sharpened pencils with me tomorrow to school. I said, Why do you need 10 sharpened pencils? She said, Because the tax is so high on sharpening pencils, I'm going to take sharpened pencils with me to school so I won't have to pay the tax to sharpen my pencil at school. I laughed and I said, My first grader knows how to avoid taxes. My first grader knows how to do this.

Some perception that, if we just raise rates on people, a lot more tax money is going to come in is foolish, based on a basic value of, when we know it's unfair, we'll find a way to get out from under it. If we had a simple, fair, clean,

straightforward tax system, we would not fight with this, and we would actually receive in the revenue that we should receive in as a Nation.

A nation does not need tax revenue. We need to be efficient, we need to be fair, and we need to be straightforward. We can do this, and we should do this.

I'd like to take just a brief moment to be able to recognize another one of my colleagues from North Carolina. This colleague has a different topic than tax reform, but it's really important this week because a mutual person that we have great respect for that he knows personally, as well, is due of honor in this week of all weeks.

So with that, I'd like to recognize my colleague from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

HONORING GEORGE BEVERLY SHEA

Mr. MCHENRY. I thank my colleague. I appreciate his leadership both with the policy committee and on this very important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor America's most beloved gospel singer. According to the Guinness Book of World Records, he holds the world record for singing in person to more people than anyone in human history, to a cumulative total of a live audience of 220 million people.

Mr. Speaker, I am rising to recognize George Beverly Shea, who passed away 2 days ago at the age of 104. "Bev," as he was affectionately known, began singing with Reverend Billy Graham in 1943. In the following years, he would travel to every State in the Union and to nearly every continent on the globe to spread the gospel.

He was inducted to the Religious Broadcasters Hall of Fame in February of 1996, and was also inducted into the inaugural class of the Conference of Southern Baptist Evangelists "Hall of Faith" in 2008.

□ 1400

From a recent visit with him, I can tell you that such awards weren't the most important things to him in life. As I visited Bev, it was a beautiful day in the summer in the town of Montreat in western North Carolina. He lived right down the hill from Dr. Graham. He wanted to be close to his friend, and that's where he chose to live.

But as I noticed his pictures of his grandchildren, behind those pictures of his family I noticed a Grammy Award. It was a Lifetime Achievement Grammy Award given to him in 2010. That was behind his family pictures. Very interesting, beautiful statement from a wonderful person. It was in the Wilshire Theatre back in 2010 when he was given that Lifetime Achievement Award, and he was with the likes of Dolly Parton and even the Ramones. So it showed that he thought family was most important.

Despite his worldwide fame though, friends and residents of his town of Montreat knew him as a person who was deeply faithful to his Lord and Savior and showed many good deeds

and great kindnesses throughout the community. He even had a tradition. Though he was known around the globe, he still took the time every year to sing "Happy Birthday" to the mayor of his small town of Montreat. What a special gentleman. What a special American. What a special Christian and man of faith.

While friends and fans from around the world and Christians from around the world know him from his renditions of "How Great Thou Art" and the "Wonder of It All," he will always be remembered by friends and family in Montreat—and beyond—as one of the most humble and gracious men that has ever been known.

Bev Shea was 104, and leaves behind a wonderful blessing of a family.

So with that, I thank my colleague for yielding and giving me the opportunity to recognize such a significant individual.

Mr. LANKFORD. I thank the gentleman. He is a man worthy of honor and worthy of spending the moment to be able to stop and discuss.

Back on tax policy—which seems a mundane topic now compared to George Beverly Shea and all that he has done for our Nation and the world—did you know that under our current system if you own a guard dog to protect your business or if you hold a business convention in Bermuda or pay for your child's clarinet lessons so that it will help with their overbite, you can deduct those expenses from our income tax?

There is something morally and culturally wrong with a government that enables its citizens to deduct their gambling losses but punishes the same person by taxing the interest that they have on savings in the bank. Why would we as a Nation deduct gambling losses and tax interest savings from the bank? Shouldn't we encourage saving and maybe discourage, or at least be neutral, for gambling losses? That's the nature of this code.

There's a section even in this code that specifically outlines that if you're a drug trafficker or drug dealer, you can't deduct your expenses from drug trafficking. That's what our code has become. We've got to find a way to be able to simplify the code and to make it a fair, straightforward code that deals with the issues and takes away the absurdity that's in our code.

Let me give you another example. We have a tax system dealing with internal taxes. In our internal tax system, we actually tell people that if you're a business that's an American-owned business and you do business with other parts of the world, you will pay that tax rate to that country, which is fair, but that when you bring your money back to the United States, you'll also have to pay the difference in our tax rate. We're the only country that does that.

So we literally tell our businesses, do business all over the world, function all over the world, make money all over

the world, but when you make money over there, we'd encourage you to leave that money over there and not bring it back home. Because if they bring it back home, they're actually punished for returning money back to the United States.

Now, what does that mean to American competition and how we actually function in our business world? What that means is if you're a German company doing business in the U.K., let's say, you pay your taxes in the U.K. and then you return your money back to headquarters. But if you're an American business doing business in the U.K., you pay the business tax in the U.K., and then you don't return your money back to America, you just reinvest in your U.K. branch. Because why would you lose all that money coming back to the United States with it? This simple fix would bring back \$1 trillion in private American capital from around the world back into the United States.

Now, in 2009, this Congress passed an almost trillion-dollar stimulus bill where they took money from each other as Americans and tried to redistribute it to say it would fix the economy. Actually, what it did was it skyrocketed our debt, and we will be paying for it for generations. And it did not resolve our fiscal situation.

What would it mean, instead of just taking money from Americans and redistributing it around and pretending we did something, what would it mean instead to allow private capital to move from all over the world from American-owned businesses to be able to come back home? It would be significant to us. It's one of those commonsense things that when I talk to people, they all nod their head and say, why don't we do that? I say, because of this, because it's so difficult to get through our Tax Code and to fix the things that are obvious.

I've even had some people say to me, well, if those American companies bring their stuff back home, they'll just buy stocks or reinvest in their building, they'll just spend it however they want to. We should tell them how to spend it. I just smile and say, it's their money; let them spend it how they choose to spend it but allow them to be able to bring it home. In fact, we should encourage American-based companies to bring American money back home when they make it rather than reinvesting all over the world. It's a commonsense thing.

It's a commonsense thing to say when you do business: no matter what type of business that you're in, don't discriminate. If they have normal business expenses, allow those normal business expenses to be written off and tax on the profit. It's a commonsense thing. But instead, our code makes it so convoluted. One business gets taxed different than another business and another business. No one can define what just basic simple business expensing is because the code is all so cluttered.

Then you see in some proposals—like the President's proposal when he put out his budget, when he said that normal business expensing should be taken away from any company that does oil or gas or coal, and instead we should give special preferences to those that do wind and solar and hydro and other things. In fact, they had the audacity to make the statement in the Treasury Green Book, they made the statement that the President wants a neutral Tax Code on energy. I had to laugh. I said, one group of companies that actually has just normal business expensing—if they have a cost for a well, they're able to deduct it like every other business does for their basic operation—gets punished in this code, and other companies get triple benefits from it. That's not neutral; that's preferences. That's back to crony capitalism.

Now, I've got to tell you, I'm all for all types of energy; I really am. I'm all for it. In my great State of Oklahoma we have geothermal; we have oil; we have gas; we use coal; we have wind. We've got all kinds of energy, and we use it all extremely well. It's a great solution for us. But the issue is not what do we do on what type of energy, it's where do we put preferences.

The code doesn't need to become even more convoluted by saying, well, the administration has certain preferences on energy, and so it's going to make it more expensive for some types, and then we're going to give special crony benefits to others. That's not the way that we need to function.

We need a code that is straightforward and clean and intentional, that we have a certain amount of money that needs to be raised to have basic operation of the Federal Government, and not raise more than that—and definitely not create a system that is even more complicated than what we have, when we have all of this giant code. Instead, we should make it more simple.

So what do we need to do? Let's set some basic guidelines. Can we create a code that is fair and straightforward? Yes. So let's get started on that. And let's start with the basics. Let's not take this code and edit. Let's take a blank sheet of paper and say, how much does the Federal Government have to raise to efficiently operate? What is the best Tax Code to start that process and begin our reform not by tweaking this, but by fixing it?

I know for certain if I went to any American and said, what is the best way to do Tax Code, no one would point to this. No one would point to our current Tax Code and say that's the best way to do it. We all get that. So let's start from there and say let's start by fixing it.

□ 1410

The second thing is let's make our Tax Code as neutral as we possibly can. What can we do to make it simple, neutral, straightforward, so that whether you're an American that makes \$20,000 a year or whether you're an American

that makes \$2 million a year, you feel like it's fair to you, there's not some sense of somebody else gets more benefits than I do out of this Code. It's a simple, straightforward Code.

So, we're going to make it neutral, we're going to make it simple, and we're going to try to make it as efficient as we possibly can. And I know the words "efficient" and "Federal Government" don't go together very often, but when we start a Code, we should start it as simple as we possibly can.

The last time there was a major reform of the Tax Code was in the 1980s, and it was to simplify the Code. Since that time, it has grown more and more and more complex again. I have every belief that if we go through the long process of simplifying our Code, which dramatically needs reform, if we will simplify our Code again, in the days ahead, future Congresses will make it more complicated again. That's the nature of government. I understand that. I'm just saying it's past time to do the simplification again.

We need to have significant reform, and not reform that's defined as: How do we stick it to a certain group to make sure they pay more? Reform that's actually reform, that fixes our broken system and walks Americans through a process where they can pay taxes, as we all love to do, but can at least pay taxes in a way that they believe is fair and neutral and consistent from year to year.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

APRIL 21, 1836, SAN JACINTO DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WENSTRUP). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 30 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as we approach April 21 this year, that is a day of importance to those of us who are from Texas.

April 21, in Houston, when I was growing up, was a holiday. My mother, who was also born on April 21, used to tell me and my sister that we had a school holiday because it was her birthday. I didn't learn that that wasn't really correct until I got to seventh grade Texas history, when I learned that April 21 was to commemorate a battle that took place in Texas, which we now call San Jacinto Day.

Most Americans have never heard of that, but that event, April 21, 1836, is of historical significance, not only to Texans, but really to all Americans.

Texas was first controlled by the nation of France up until 1689. And then the Spanish Government, country, took over the control of what we now call Texas and controlled it for over 130 years until 1821—1690 to 1821.

The nation of Mexico revolted against Spanish oppression, and in 1821 became a republic of itself, and Texas belonged to Mexico until 1836. Texas

declared independence on March 2, 1836. And then we had April 21, 1836, the day of the Battle of San Jacinto.

Well, let me back up a little bit and explain why Texas revolted against Mexico, how it became an independent country for 9 years and then later joined the United States.

Mr. Speaker, here is a map of what Mexico looked like in about 1821 after Mexico had revolted from Spain. It all happened because of the person who took charge of Mexico. His name was Santa Anna.

Santa Anna became President of Mexico in the 1820s and quickly made himself dictator of Mexico. He was supported by the military. He became the military dictator. He abolished the constitution of Mexico. He abolished the Congress of Mexico, and not all of the people in Mexico approved it. In fact, 11 different states in Mexico revolted against this dictatorship.

A lot of times in Mexican or world history, we don't talk about the other revolts in Mexico because of this dictator, because of this tyrant, but it did happen. Eleven states revolted. Those are on this map.

This map shows what Mexico looked like in 1821. The red portions are several of the states that revolted against the dictator, Santa Anna. They were: San Luis Potosi, Queretaro, Durango, Guanajuato, Michoacan, Yucatan, Jalisco, Nuevo Leon, Tamaulipas, Zacatecas, and Coahuila de Texas, which also included Texas. These red areas revolted against Mexican rule.

Santa Anna, being President and Commander in Chief, quickly assembled his professional army and started putting down rebellions in Mexico. In fact, three of these areas claimed to be countries. There was the Republic of the Yucatan. Here is the Yucatan Peninsula, which we have all heard about. There was the Republic of the Rio Grande. And then, of course, there was the Republic of Texas, all claiming independence from the tyrant.

In fact, there was a portion of this revolution that almost succeeded in the interior of Mexico. The Zacatecas area had as good an army as Santa Anna, but their rebellion was put down quickly by Santa Anna. In fact, it was put down so brutally that other areas of the republic began to tremble. So, after these areas were put down in rebellion, Santa Anna moved his army north into what we now call Texas.

The events in Texas occurred simultaneously with all these independent revolts, but this is the event that triggered it. It happened in October of 1835—Texas, a part of Mexico. The small town of Gonzales, Texas, had a cannon that they used to protect themselves from the Apaches, the Karankawas, and other Indian tribes. The Mexican Government decided they would take the arms of the Texans, as they called themselves; they would take the cannon. So a Mexican militia showed up, or a Mexican army showed up at Gonzales demanding return of the

cannon and a skirmish ensued. Guns were fired, and the Texas Revolution was on.

For your information, the Mexican Government was not successful in starting or taking that cannon.

It's interesting to note that the Texas Revolution started, the first battle started, because government tried to take away the arms of the citizens. Interesting enough, you go backwards to Lexington and Concord, if we remember our American history, the British marched to Lexington and Concord, started the battle in the American War of Independence, and the reason: the British Government tried to take the arms, the firearms, of the colonists. They were not successful. And the same event triggered the Texas Revolution. In fact, it was called the "shot heard 'round the world."

But, in any event, the battles and skirmishes occurred. It started in October of 1835 in this area of Texas, San Antonio area primarily.

A group of Texans—really, they were volunteers from all over the United States, almost every State in the United States, a half a dozen foreign countries—had assembled themselves, 187 of these individuals, along with 11 Tejanos. "Tejano" is a uniquely Texan name for Texans of Spanish descent. And those 187 volunteers found themselves in an old beat-up Spanish church that was 100 years old at the time, that we now call the Alamo.

They knew, of course, that Santa Anna had crossed into the United States, or into Texas, across the Rio Grande River and was headed straight for the Alamo. Those defenders, rather than leave, they decided to stay. They knew, of course, that they would not be able to defend and protect the Alamo very long, because Santa Anna's Army was several thousand strong versus 187 Texans.

They were led by one of my most famous or favorite persons in all of history, a 27-year-old lawyer from South Carolina named William Barret Travis. He was the commander of those volunteers at the Alamo. For 13 days they held off the Mexican army; and we've heard the story in the history of the Alamo, how they withstood the onslaught for 13 days.

□ 1420

Travis asked for help, for people to come to the Alamo. No one came to help him except 32 volunteers from, yes, the town of Gonzales. And while he was behind those Alamo walls, he wrote probably the most famous letter written by any military leader in our history. It was dated February 24, 1836. I have a copy of this letter on my wall, as do many Texans that represent Texas in the House of Representatives. I think it's a call to freedom and liberty in the spirit of our ancestors.

He said:

Fellow citizens, I am besieged by 1,000 or more of the enemy under Santa Anna. I have sustained a continual bombardment and cannon fire for over 24 hours, but I have not lost